

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-8, 14-22, 28-29, 33, 35, and 37-39 are currently pending in the present application, with Claims 1, 4-8, 14-18, 20-22, 28, 29, 33, and 37-39 being amended, Claims 2, 3, 9-13, 30-32, 34, 36, and 40 being canceled, and Claims 23-27 withdrawn from consideration. Reconsideration and reexamination of the claims, as amended, are respectfully requested.

The Examiner objected to the Title of the present application as non-descriptive. Applicants have amended the Title to more clearly describe the claimed invention.

The Examiner objected to Claims 1-22 and 28-40 for various informalities. Applicants have amended the claims to correct the informalities.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-9, 12-16, 19, 22, and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Baskett (U.S. patent no. 6,333,672). This rejection is moot with respect to the canceled claims and respectfully traversed with respect to the amended claims.

Claims 1 and 22 are directed to current switches that, as discussed in pages 7-8 of the present application, include a cascode circuit having supplied thereto trickle current at the outputs of the switching transistors. By implementing the cascode circuits with trickle currently, the switching time of the transistors can be reduced, and parasitic capacitance can be eliminated. The trickled cascode circuit in the present invention act not as a digital gate, but as a switched current source unit cell in a segmented R-2R DAC. In accordance with one embodiment, multiple unit cells are summed together into a load resistor. The implementation of trickle currents in this respect is not taught or suggested by Baskett.

Baskett is directed to a method for maintaining differential input transistors and does not contain any disclosure of providing trickle currents to reduce switching time of a current switch, as

recited in the amended Claims 1 and 22. Rather, the current sources 16 and 18 in Baskett, as cited by the Examiner, provide a “normal amount of current flowing through cascode amplifiers 12 and 14.” In this regard, Baskett teaches away from the present invention of implementing trickle currents. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Claims 1 and 22, and all pending claims dependent therefrom, are not anticipated by or obvious in view of Baskett.

The Examiner rejected Claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baskett in view of any one of Spratt (U.S. patent no. 4,948,989), Whitfield (U.S. patent no. 5,764,097), and Hunley et al. (U.S. patent no. 4,956,567). This rejection is moot in view of the canceled claims

The Examiner rejected Claims 17, 18, 28-30, and 33-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baskett in view of applicants’ admitted prior art. This rejection is moot with respect to the canceled claims and respectfully traversed with respect to the amended claims.

With respect to Claims 17 and 18, these claims are dependent from Claim 1 and are accordingly respectfully submitted as in condition for allowance for the reasons stated above with respect to Claim 1. Similarly, with respect to Claim 28 and the remainder of the claims dependent thereupon, Baskett does not contain any disclosure or suggestion of supplying trickle currents to a pair of cascode transistors, as recited in Claim 28. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 28-30 and 33-37 are also not anticipated, nor obvious in view of, Baskett.

The Examiner rejected Claims 20, 21, 38, and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baskett. This rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to the amended claims. Claims 20 and 21 depend from Claim 1, and Claims 38 and 39 depend from Claim 28;

accordingly, for the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 20, 21, 38, and 39 are also not anticipated by, nor obvious in view of, Baskett.

The Examiner rejected Claims 31 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baskett in view of applicants' admitted prior art and further in view of any one of Spratt, Whitfield, and Hunley et al. This rejection is moot in view of the canceled claims.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 535352003600.

Dated: February 11, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 
David T. Yang
Registration No.: 44,415
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
555 West Fifth Street, Suite 3500
Los Angeles, California 90013
(213) 892-5587